

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached Replacement Sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 4. This Replacement Sheet, which includes FIG. 4, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 4. In amended FIG. 4, flowchart decision points have been labeled “Yes” or “No.”

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet showing changes

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 18, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 6-13, and 15-24 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 16, and 17 are in independent form. Claims 3-5 and 14 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 1, 2, 6-13, and 15-24 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to the drawings, because the decision points in the flowchart of FIG. 4 are not labeled. Submitted herewith is a Replacement Sheet of corrected drawings, which includes changes to FIG. 4. In amended FIG. 4, decision points have been labeled. Applicants submit that the amendments to the drawings add no new matter to the original disclosure, and support for the amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs 59 and 60. Approval of the amended drawings, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to Claims 10 and 14 because of informalities. Claim 10 has been amended to delete an extraneous period. Cancellation of Claim 14 renders the objection thereto moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to Claims 10 and 14.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,985,955 (*Gullotta et al.*); that Claim 2 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020174227 (*Hartsell et al.*); that Claim 3 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,560 (*Mullen et al.*); that Claim 4 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view

of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020194350 (*Lu et al.*); that Claim 5 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050177635 (*Schmidt et al.*); that Claims 6-8 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,216 (*Steegmans*); that Claims 11, 14, and 23 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050043961 (*Torres et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030009540 (*Benfield et al.*); that Claims 12 and 21 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030145093 (*Oren et al.*); that Claim 15 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050010671 (*Grannon*); that Claim 18 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020161904 (*Tredoux et al.*); that Claims 19 and 24 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020064149 (*Elliot et al.*); and that Claim 20 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gullotta et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20060168253 (*Baba et al.*). Cancellation of Claims 3-5 and 14 renders their rejections moot. Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 16, and 17, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a computer implemented method for dynamically provisioning computing resources. The method includes receiving a request for a computing resource, where the request is associated with an asset. An asset classification of the asset, a business value of the asset, and a resource classification related

to the asset are determined. The asset classification is at least one of: a public asset, a business confidential asset, a private asset, and a secret asset. The business value of the asset is one of: a low value, a medium value and, a high value. The resource classification is one of: a trusted classification for internal entities and a non-trusted classification for external entities. The computing resource is provisioned based on the determining step.

Notable features of Claim 1 include determining an asset classification of the asset, a business value of the asset, and a resource classification related to the asset, wherein the asset classification is at least one of: a public asset, a business confidential asset, a private asset, and a secret asset, wherein the business value of the asset is one of: a low value, a medium value, and a high value, and wherein the resource classification is one of: a trusted classification for internal entities and a non-trusted classification for external entities. By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 1 is able to use multi-dimensional decision criteria to prioritize provisioning of assets.

As understood by Applicants, *Gullotta et al.* relates to a method for provisioning users with resources. *Gullotta et al.* teaches that a set of attributes, organizational information, and user roles are established, and that resource provisioning policies are defined based on selected attributes, organizational information, and user roles. Apparently, the attributes, organizational information, and user roles taught by *Gullotta et al.* are used to characterize a user who requests an asset, not the requested asset itself.

Nothing has been found in *Gullotta et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest “determining an asset classification of said asset, a business value of said asset, and a resource classification related to said asset, wherein said asset classification is at least one of: a public asset, a business confidential asset, a private asset, and a secret asset, wherein said business value

of said asset is one of: a low value, a medium value, and a high value, and wherein said resource classification is one of: a trusted classification for internal entities and a non-trusted classification for external entities,” as claimed in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Gullotta et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claims 16 and 17 include features similar to those discussed above. Therefore, Claims 16 and 17 also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1896519\_1